

# Interview Summary

Application No.

09/226,107

Applicant(s)

WATANABE ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph R. Pokrzywa

Art Unit

2622

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph R. Pokrzywa.

(3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Phillip Mancini.

(4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 27 August 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed: Tanoue et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,884,117)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Joseph R. Pokrzywa 8/27/03  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed current limitation of "space provided above the recording section". Tanoue still can be interpreted as anticipating the claim. Further discussed a possible amendment to distinguish over the prior art, which describes the reading unit being disposed vertically above the recording unit.